DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 124 529 SP 010 136

AUTHOR Dennis, Evie G.
TITLE Developing and Implementing a Viable Intergroup Education Program in the Denver Public Schools.
PUB DATE 6 Feb 76
NOTE 85p.; ; Ed.D. Maxi II Practicum, Nova University

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; Human Relations Programs; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Intergroup Relations; Interpersonal Problems; *Interpersonal Relationship; Parent School Relationship; Professional Training; Public Schools; School Community Cooperation; School Personnel; *Student Alienation; Student Teacher Relationship; *Teacher Workshops
IDENTIFIERS *Denver (Colorado)

ABSTRACT

This practicum assumed the responsibility of developing and implementing inservice training for personnel in the Denver Public Schools, as required by a federal district court decree. Emphasis of the inservice training was intended to improve skills in interpersonal communications with pupils, parents, community members, and other school personnel so that student alienation would be reduced. Teachers were provided skills in diagnosing classroom tension and problems and in designing action plans to resolve them. At least five hours of inservice training were received by most personnel. Some school staffs planned additional inservice activities beyond the required five hours. Assistance in planning and conducting inservice activities was provided through five specially trained teachers who served as inservice facilitators. Several other Denver school employees also were utilized as consultants and conducted many inservice sessions. Selected teacher-leaders were involved in special training sessions in order to gain skills in working with their respective building level programs. A guide was prepared to aid in developing and implementing these programs. The entire human relations program was under the direction of the Community Specialist and Staff Orientation and Training Specialist. (Author/RC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

2-11-76

SP

ED124529

DEVELOPING AND IMPLEMENTING A VIABLE INTERGROUP EDUCATION PROGRAM IN THE DENVER PUBLIC SCHOOLS

by Evie G. Dennis

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, Nova University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Denver Cluster
Dr. Harold A. Stetzler

Maxi II Practicum
February 6, 1976

SP 010 136

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	1
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	3
DEFINITION OF TERMS	13
PURPOSE OF PRACTICUM	14
DESIGN AND PROCEDURES	16
Training of Teacher-Leaders	18
Preparation of Guide	20
EVALUATION OF THE DISTRICT-WIDE PROGRAM	21
Formative Evaluation	21
Summative Evaluation	22
EVALUATION OF TEACHER-LEADER TRAINING PROGRAM	27
Formative Evaluation	27
Summative Evaluation	27
ANALYSIS OF DATA	37
DISCUSSION	40
NATIONAL FOCUS	46
LIMITATIONS OF STUDY	47
SUMMARY	48
CONCLUSIONS	50

PAGE

APPENDIX C. 67

APPENDIX D. 73

APPENDIX E. 87

LIST OF TABLES

PAGE

Table 1 - Groups of Respondents 22

Table 2 - Questions and Tabulated Results 23

Table 3 - Responses to Interviews 28

Table 4 - Evaluation of Teacher Leadership. 29

Table 5 - Teacher-Leader Training Evaluation. 31

Developing and Implementing a Viable Intergroup Education Program in the Denver Public Schools

by Evie G. Dennis[1]

INTRODUCTION

The development of a human relations program in each school was viewed as a part of the district-wide effort in human relations and as an appropriate component in the further implementation of the district's integration program.

With the implementation of the 1974 Federal District Court order to desegregate the Denver schools root and branch, staffs have found themselves dealing with increased diversity in customs, habits, language and learning patterns. Success in coping with these differences has varied with experience and the quantity of

---

[1]Evie G. Dennis is Community Specialist and Staff Orientation and Training Specialist, Office of Community Affairs, Denver Public Schools, Denver, Colorado. This practicum was performed in the Denver Public Schools.

trained personnel. Helping students move from a social pattern of isolation to one of optimal interaction presents a challenge that gives great impetus to staff development and the development of good human relations programs. Dealing with intergroup relations is no longer a matter of teaching preference, but is an educational imperative which is vital to the orderly implementation of integration and the development of a humane atmosphere in our schools. Human relations training involves intensive group self-study procedures, designed to bring about increased sensitivity and skill in relation to social-psychological phenomena occurring in interpersonal, group, and organizational situations.

Urban, industrialized, "developed" societies demand increasing sophistication about social phenomena, polemics about "individualism" notwithstanding. The ubiquitous formal organization, the voluntary association, and family life itself demand enhanced skills of collaboration, social sensitivity, and creative work in the company of others, supported by new cognitions and attitudes. All this implies re-education of the adult in a greater or lesser degree.

Human relations training is a predictable response to these demands. It represents a new and probably unique domain of

applied social science. It is therapeutic, in the sense of "role therapy," yet it deals with normal persons in search of improved social skills, not with cure of illness, disorder, or pathology. It is certainly educative - it involves teaching of concepts from the social sciences - yet it goes well beyond cognitive change to deal with the feelings and attitudes of the individual, as he experimentally re-examines his own behavior in interaction with others.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The concept of human relations training grew out of Kurt Lewin's experimental work in group dynamics in the 1940's. His attempt to investigate new ways of teaching individual and group skills cleared the path for others who followed. In the 1950's, the movement developed an emphasis on the social-psychological approach, resulting in confusion about human relations or "sensitivity" training. Much of this confusion is due to obscure direction or purpose - specifically, the lack of differentiation between group experiences that are planned to assist a group in solving organizational problems and experiences organized to enhance the individual's personal growth. A failure to differentiate has caused heated arguments and verbal attacks from opposing sides. The term

"sensitivity," in fact, is "sensitive" to most people and public schools have consequently been reluctant to become involved in such training programs.

Regardless of the "image" human relations training may have, few educators dispute the need for improved understanding and communication among public school staffs. For proof, one need only attend a faculty meeting or participate in a task force or planning session. Despite great rationale, brilliant thinking and foolproof plans, progress is blocked and conflict becomes unmanageable because of a lack of human understanding and poor communications.

Much of the literature concerning the humanistic and self-actualization programs in inservice for teachers has resulted from desegregation problems, urban problems, and problems of educating the disadvantaged. However, teachers and educators in all social situations have the need to grow and to self-actualize. They need to understand their values and attitudes, and to develop the skills which will improve their effectiveness in the classroom and help them to deepen their personalities and that of their students. Teachers need training to free them to increase in depth and breadth in their fields in this ever-changing society. Traditional

teaching patterns and the traditional social structure of schools have largely ignored this, and as a result, have stifled enthusiasm and commitment. Rather than the classroom being the exciting cradle for nurturing inquisitive minds, it is all too often a bore and a chore with teachers feeling guilty because they have failed to meet the goals and the needs of students. This belief is expressed eloquently in the works of such authors as William Glasser[2], John Holt[3], Neil Postman[4], Charles Silberman[5], A. S. Neil[6], and Marshall McLuhan[7].

Bash[8] states that an individual's perception (accurate or distorted) of a situation influences his behavior. Perception

---

[2]William Glasser: Schools without Failure; New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

[3]John Holt: How Children Fail; New York: Pitman Publishing Company, 1964.

[4]Neil Postman: Teaching as a Subversive Activity; New York: Delacorte Press, 1969.

[5]Charles Silberman: Crisis in the Classroom: The Remaking of American Education; New York: Random House, 1970.

[6]A. S. Neil: Summerhill: A Radical Approach to Child Rearing; New York: Hart Company, 1960.

[7]Marshall McLuhan: The Medium Is the Massage; New York: Random House, 1967.

[8]James H. Bash: Effective Teaching in the Desegregated Schools: Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1973, p.7.

and behavior both are influenced by attitudes toward the people and objects in the situation. Therefore, a teacher in an integrated setting must examine his own attitudes toward members of other races so that he can develop satisfactory working relationships with them. Attitudes do not change rapidly, but many stereotypes and distortions do disappear when black, brown, red, yellow, and white teachers - out of mutual concern for the education of all children - meet and discuss common problems. Concern for children by teachers of different races hopefully will lead teachers to recognize each other, regardless of race, as professionals, as persons worthy of respect and dignity, and as colleagues with similar goals.

Hence, an important factor to take into account in examining one's own attitudes is that, to be meaningful, the examination must take place in a group setting. Self-examination without the input from one's colleagues probably will result in the conclusion, "I'm all right; it must be the other person whose attitude needs changing." Of course, this is the safest procedure and the least threatening conclusion; one's own ego does not get hurt, changing oneself is not necessary. Bash, therefore, feels that there is greater pay-off for intergroup relations in the enlightened discussion group than there is in following only the uncommitting

experience of reading independently with no follow-up discussion.[9]

Chesler[10] writes that attempts to alter educational roles and structures through desegregation, decentralization, or other means will succeed only if we can train and retrain more sympathetic, skillful, and effective teachers. He further states that it is vital to design and to implement training programs for administrators and teachers to help them to deal with their own racism and what is likely to happen in interracial schools. Teachers who overtly perpetuate racial injustice are a danger to everybody. If they are retrainable, they should be retrained; if not, they should be fired.[11]

Supporting the need for good human relations programs is a review of the account of man, in the absence of adequate relationships, to emphasize the disastrous effects that human isolation can have on personality development and destruction of potentiality.

---

[9]Bash, op. cit., p. 9.

[10]Mark A. Chesler: "Teacher Training Designs for Improving Instruction in Interracial Classrooms," The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 7, No. 5, 1971, 636.

[11]Mark A. Chesler, "Desegregation and School Crisis," Integrated Education: A Report on Race and Schools, 10, No. 6, 1972, 60.

The need for man to progress is clearly described in a paper by Dubos[12] concerning the potentialities of man. He writes that man, biologically, has not changed basically for the past 50,000 years, although he has developed tremendous technological changes. Man's basic nature has remained permanent, but not fully developed. Because of this, there is a definite limitation as to what technology can do for us. In Dubos' words:

> There is no doubt but that we must learn to govern our technological society in such a manner that we are not compelled to adapt ourselves to techonlogical innovations, because we cannot do it, but that in contrast we learn to manage technological innovations so that they are best suited to those characters that are the fundamental and unchangeable characters of mankind.

He proposes that our chief concern should not be the frontier of scientific technology, but rather the unchangeable frontiers - biological frontiers - of man. Human societies have <u>not</u> yet fully taken advantage of the potential resources of man's unchangeable nature.

Research supporting the theoretical need for improvement of human relations exist for almost any level of maturation and

---

[12]R. J. Dubos, "The Potentialities of Man." Paper read at the Third Plenary Session of the Tenth National Conference of the U. S. National Commission for UNESCO, Kansas City, Missouri, November 16, 1965.

development. Among the most classic studies cited in this area are those of Spitz[13] and Bowlby[14] on young children. The findings reported in these studies indicated that mental health depends in large measure on the ability to develop good human relationships, even at very young ages. Burks[15], utilizing the techniques of co-twin control with identical twins, noted the difference at twelve and one-half years of age between twins who had been reared in different adoptive homes from the age of two weeks. Although the twins had similar developmental histories, expressive movements, and interests, the twin raised in the more adequate and stimulating environment was more advanced in educational achievement and had greater skill in handling social relationships. The significance of this type of research is in the highly similar genetic potential of the twins, placing emphasis on the learning process.

---

[13]R. A. Spitz and K. M. Wolf, "Anaclitic Depression: An Inquiry into the Genesis of Psychiatric Conditions in Early Childhood," The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child, ed. by Anna Freud, et al, Vol. II; New York: International University Press, 1946, pp. 313-342.

[14]J. Bowlby: Child Care and the Growth of Love; Baltimore, Penguin Books, 1963.

[15]B. S. Burks, "A Study of Identical Twins Reared Apart under Differing Types of Family Relationships," Studies in Personality, ed. by Q. McNemar and M. A. Merrill; New York: McGraw-Hill, 1942.

Yarrow and Campbell[16] revealed that children who are active participants in human interaction tend to bring their awareness of others into a much greater judgmental focus than children who are nonparticipants.

Studies by Kievet[17] on the social adjustment of college students who participate in formal organizations and those who do not participate in such organizations reveal that those who actively interact with people show significantly better adjustment than nonparticipants in the same category. Buckhout[18] reported that the need for social approval is an important source of motivation in the prediction of attitude change.

In his studies of the U. S. Marines, considered by many to be the toughest outfit of fighting men in the world, Hankoff[19] stated that they were dependent upon social influence for their

---

[16]M. Y. Yarrow and J. D. Campbell, "Person Perception in Children," Merrill-Palmer Quarterly Behavior and Development, 9, 1963, pp. 57-72.

[17]Mary B. Kievet, "Social Participation and Social Adjustment," Journal of Educational Research, 58, No. 7, 1965, 303-306.

[18]R. Buckhout, "Need for Social Approval and Attitude Change," Journal of Psychology, 60, 1965, pp. 123-128.

[19]L. D. Hankoff, "An Epidemic of Attempted Suicide," Comprehensive Psychiatry, 2, No. 5, 1961, 294-298.

very survival. His research indicated that even Marines, when in isolation for twelve months, attempt suicide at a high rate, share a distaste for their immediate environment and have a desire to be out of it.

Perhaps the most revealing study, and indeed one of the most often cited, of the effects of human influence, is that reported by Roethlisberger and Dickson[20], and referred to as the Hawthorne Studies. The conclusion reached in these studies, in actuality, was that the increase in production by the subjects involved was due to the fact that for the first time during their term of employment, someone seemed to be taking an interest in the work they were doing. It was this humanistic interaction that produced an attitude change on the part of the employees causing them to become highly motivated workers, which ultimately affected production.

Hall[21] has constructed a theory based on the belief that human beings have the potentiality to become either positive,

---

[20]F. J. Roethlisberger and W. J. Dickson, Management and the Worker; Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1939.

[21]W. E. Hall, H. Angelino, and P. L. Warren, "Multifactor Effect in Change in Human Behavior," Journal of Educational Research, 45, 1951, pp. 49-54.

responsible, friendly, productive individuals, or negative, suspicious, hostile, irresponsible persons. If we ultimately want the good, productive individual, we must first believe that this type of behavior can be developed. Secondly, we must give recognition for desirable behavior when it appears, begin to develop good behavior to its full potential, and we must attempt to understand the reasons for this type of behavior. Hall, however, recognizes that this effort requires a tremendous amount of insight and empathy on the part of the individual.

The humanistic view of education encompasses many aspects, yet there is a common thread unifying this vast area in the educational setting. That thread is the recognition of the value of human worth, the importance of individual dignity, and the commitment to the ideal of education as the means through which the individual may grow to the fullest potential. Although this review of the literature is intended to be comprehensive, it is by no means complete. Within the last decade, numerous publications have dealt with this topic. These basic theories and findings underlie the work performed in this practicum.

DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

Human Relations - the practice of a skill by which one learns to relate himself to his social surroundings. It is the way Tom, Dick, and Jane learn about themselves and their relations to each other in the first instance and how they improve this understanding in the second instance.

"Human Relations Skill" - is the capacity of a person to communicate his feelings and ideas to others, to receive such communications from others, and to respond to their feelings and ideas in such a fashion as to promote congenial participation in a common task.[22]

Intergroup Education - refers to an important class of intra-organizational relationships, such as between departments, groups of people, teacher-student, teacher-parents, teacher-administrator, etc.

Note: In this practicum the terms "Human relations" and "intergroup education" are used synonymously.

---

[22] F. J. Roethlisberger, G. F. F. Lombard, and H. O. Ronken: Training for Human Relations; Boston: Harvard University, 1954 p. 172.

PURPOSE OF THE PRACTICUM

The overall purpose of this practicum was to implement a long-range human relations program that would serve -

a) to meet the needs of staff, students and communities as they face the unique problems incident to school desegregation and integration;

b) to prepare the local school planning group to deal with these issues through specific communications techniques acquired through a series of training sessions;

c) to provide a mechanism for meaningful dialogue among students, parents, teachers, administrators, and various other facets of the community to foster better communications, understanding, and to promote general goodwill; and

d) to provide background information which would enable the school community to better understand its own diversity;

A secondary purpose was to prepare a guide that will help district personnel develop programs which deal more effectively with intergroup relations.

Stated more specifically in terms of measurable objectives, the first year's plan was designed to -

1) improve administrative communication skills with staff, pupils, and community;

2) improve teacher skills in diagnosing classroom problems and designing action plans to resolve them, paying particular attention to student alienation and improvement of student pride;

3) increase the number of teachers trained in diagnosing classroom problems and designing action plans to resolve them;

4) improve teachers' communication skills with staff, pupils, and community;

5) improve skills of the clerical staff in interpersonal communications with pupils and parents to reduce student alienation during the first contacts with the new school;

6) improve skills of the bus drivers and aides in interpersonal communications with pupils and parents.

DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

During the 1974-75 school year, students, staff, and parents planned creative activities and ways to improve the quality of human relations and communication skills in their respective school communities.

To accomplish this, every school and department was required to implement a human relations program. Each school and department was allowed to develop its program within the framework of a district-wide directive. Such flexibility enabled the local administrator to accommodate the specific needs of his school or department. The setting of program goals was done by the local building/department personnel, working within the overriding goal of the district's program to foster an atmosphere of better understanding and cooperation throughout the community among staffs, students, and parents.

The district-wide program was conducted by this practitioner through the Office of Community Affairs. Assistance in planning and conducting inservice activities was provided through five specially trained teachers who served as inservice facilitators. These teachers-on-special-assignment and this practitioner functioned as a team in assisting each school in establishing and

implementing an individualized program. Other district personnel were utilized as facilitators and consultants when needed.

It was necessary for this team to establish its own goals; thus the task had to be defined. Therefore, the thesis was proposed that it is vital that people communicate and relate to other people in an open, positive manner in an effort to foster better understanding and interpersonal relations.

Being cognizant of the fact that the responsibility and success of the program rest with the local administrator, the facilitative team offered to do the following:

a) assist the school community in identifying issues and needs in terms of intergroup relations;

b) prepare the local school planning group to deal with those issues and needs through specific communications techniques;

c) provide background information which would enable the school community to better understand its own diversity;

d) provide means and suggest ways of evaluating the effectiveness of the local school's program.

At lease five hours of human relations training was received by most personnel for the school year 1974-75. Some school staffs planned additional inservice activities beyond the required five hours.

Training of Teacher-Leaders

Teachers were selected by each building principal to become involved in a program designed to increase their awareness of human relations concepts to the point that they could become leaders in their respective schools. They would be the teachers who would act as multipliers of competence in matters of human relations.

Content was presented to the participants in a variety of ways such as role playing, awareness sessions, force field techniques, developing communication skills, multi-cultural activities, classroom management techniques, getting a group together, problem solving techniques, conflict resolution, etc. (Appendix A), with the assumption that significant gain would be made in accomplishing the following objectives:

1) Participants would know and be able to utilize methods for gaining close communications between home and school,

particularly the homes of low achievers and those students with little or no profile in their respective schools.

2) Participants would have knowledge of the dimensions of cultural differences among the people who make up the American society.

3) Participants would have reappraised their own feelings with respect to self, social class, race, colleagues, and school structures.

4) Participants would be able to utilize understandings derived from simulated experiences of interpersonal problems arising in a desegregated school setting.

5) Participants would know and be able to utilise methods to help students increase their own self understanding.

6) Participants would have knowledge of methods and techniques for creating a classroom environment that fosters acceptance and understanding.

7) Participants would be able to sensitively and skillfully diagnose educational needs of students with differing abilities and backgrounds and be able to design relevant educational experiences for such students based upon the workshop experience.

Two hundred fifty-eight teacher-leader participants respresenting 121 schools met for two sessions of four hours each in April, 1975, and one session of four hours in September, 1975, (Appendix A).

After the 1975 spring sessions, the teacher-leaders were provided released time from their regular duties to organize, meet, and plan with their building human relations resource committees. The facilitators met with all committees who requested their assistance. Released time was also provided for teacher-leaders to meet with their committees for planning the 1975-76 program.

Preparation of the Guide

A guide designed to provide activities, materials, and resources for teachers, counselors, administrators, and other staff members to use in intergroup relations involving students, parents, and other members of the community was prepared by this practitioner. This guide has been placed in each school and department and will be used in the further implementation of the human relations program. A copy is submitted as a part of this practicum report.

EVALUATION OF THE DISTRICT-WIDE PROGRAM

Both formative and summative evaluations were completed which offered evidence for making decisions about the merit of the district-wide program. External goal-free evaluations were made by federal monitors since much of the program was financed with Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) funds, as well as by the court-appointed Community Education Council.[23] Results of these evaluations are shown as Appendix B.

Formative Evaluation

The effectiveness of each inservice session was rated on a five-point scale by the participants. The scale ranged from very effective (1) to very ineffective (5). Results show that -

- 205 inservice sessions were conducted during the 1974-75 school year; 192 inservice sessions were rated as being at least somewhat effective while 13 were rated as neither effective nor ineffective
- mean rating of all inservices was 1.9
- rating by bus drivers and all transportation personnel indicated that the inservice session was somewhat effective with a mean rating of 1.8

[23]The Community Education Council is a group of citizens appointed by the Judge in the Tenth Circuit Court and charged with monitoring the progress of the implementation of the Court order concerning integration.

Summative Evaluation

A questionnaire designed by this practitioner was sent to a sample of teachers, administrators, clerical personnel, custodians, and lunchroom employees (Appendix C). Questions from this instrument were utilized to help determine the progress made in achieving the program goals. Ten percent of the teachers, or at least one in each building, were randomly selected to complete the questionnaire. A thirty percent sample of each of the other groups was chosen randomly from lists containing names of all employees in each classification. The number of employees responding from each group is shown in the following table.

Table 1

Groups of Respondents	Number	
	Elementary	Secondary
Administrator	31	19
Teacher	491	489
Clerical	32	27
Lunchroom	50	33
Custodial	25	28

Questions of concqrn that were used in this report and their tabulated results follow.

Table 2

Questions and Tabulated Results

Possible Responses:

1	2	3	4	5
Great	Some	No Opinion	Little	Not at All

1. To what extent do you feel teacher-student relationships were improved by the inservice activities designed to promote these relationships?

	Elementary					Secondary				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Administrator	0%	75%	7%	17%	0%	5%	79%	0%	16%	0%
Teacher	5	50	8	29	8	2	41	8	39	10
Clerical	3	40	20	30	7	4	55	19	22	0
Lunchroom	4	48	40	8	0	3	22	50	22	3
Custodial	4	44	36	12	4	7	30	48	4	11

2. To what extent do you feel staff-teacher relationships were improved?

	Elementary					Secondary				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Administrator	10%	64%	10%	16%	0%	0%	79%	0%	11%	10%
Teacher	5	46	12	28	9	2	41	12	35	10
Clerical	3	42	10	29	16	8	44	11	37	0
Lunchroom	6	44	31	11	8	0	35	23	32	10
Custodial	12	52	12	12	12	14	25	25	25	11

3. To what extent did the inservices help you to understand and relate to other people as individuals?

	Elementary					Secondary				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Administrator	10%	64%	10%	10%	6%	0%	84%	0%	11%	5%
Teacher	11	51	5	24	9	5	39	7	35	14
Clerical	10	61	0	23	6	19	50	8	23	0
Lunchroom	12	64	8	6	10	6	40	3	27	24
Custodial	20	36	4	28	12	11	39	7	4	39

4. To what extent have you become more aware of the school district as a social system that embraces all ethnic groups and cultures?

	Elementary					Secondary				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Administrator	29%	26%	9%	26%	10%	16%	53%	5%	10%	16%
Teacher	18	42	9	20	11	14	42	10	23	11
Clerical	17	45	10	21	7	33	30	11	15	11
Lunchroom	23	48	13	12	4	6	63	9	16	6
Custodial	16	40	36	4	4	11	39	25	7	18

5. As a result of the inservice programs, to what extent do you feel more secure in dealing with problems related to school desegregation?

	Elementary					Secondary				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Administrator	7%	32%	13%	42%	6%	5%	53%	5%	21%	16%
Teacher	4	40	13	27	16	3	28	14	35	20
Clerical	0	43	14	33	10	11	48	11	15	15
Lunchroom	8	44	12	19	17	3	25	31	19	22
Custodial	4	36	24	12	24	0	25	29	14	32

6. To what extent have you gained greater understanding of your students' attitudes and behaviors, as a result of the inservice programs?

	Elementary					Secondary				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Administrator	6%	42%	19%	23%	10%	5%	53%	11%	21%	10%
Teacher	9	49	7	25	10	5	35	7	40	13
Clerical	3	28	31	25	13	15	58	8	15	4
Lunchroom	13	28	28	10	21	7	41	24	14	14
Custodial	4	32	36	0	28	11	25	43	7	14

7. To what extent do you feel better prepared to help students increase their own self-understanding?

	Elementary					Secondary				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Administrator	19%	52%	7%	19%	3%	16%	53%	5%	10%	16%
Teacher	13	52	10	19	6	9	45	12	25	9
Clerical	3	29	26	32	10	15	37	22	22	4
Lunchroom	8	36	31	8	17	4	38	31	17	10
Custodial	20	28	32	8	12	11	14	32	18	25

8. To what extent do you feel better prepared to utilize methods and techniques for creating an environment that fosters acceptance and understanding of student' individual differences?

	Elementary					Secondary				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Administrator	20%	58%	3%	16%	3%	5%	67%	0%	17%	11%
Teacher	11	53	9	20	7	9	39	15	27	10
Clerical	6	28	26	31	9	7	48	19	19	7
Lunchroom	2	51	32	6	9	0	44	22	19	15
Custodial	4	40	28	16	12	7	21	50	4	18

9. To what extent do you feel better prepared to utilize methods and techniques for creating an environment that fosters acceptance and understanding of other adults with whom you work?

	Elementary					Secondary				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Administrator	19%	61%	0%	13%	7%	11%	55%	0%	28%	6%
Teacher	11	50	13	19	7	5	42	15	28	10
Clerical	0	56	10	25	9	11	59	8	15	7
Lunchroom	10	44	24	10	12	0	54	28	11	7
Custodial	4	28	24	32	12	22	26	18	19	15

10. To what extent do you feel that you are more adequately prepared to participate in planning and organizing programs which serve multicultural/multiracial education?

	Elementary					Secondary				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Administrators	19%	48%	3%	23%	7%	22%	50%	0%	22%	6%
Teacher	9	43	13	26	9	7	33	14	33	13
Clerical	0	23	23	32	22	7	26	11	45	11
Lunchroom	2	15	47	15	21	0	15	41	18	26
Custodial	4	24	44	4	24	11	11	39	21	18

Interviews were made with various personnel in a random sampling of schools to answer the following questions:

- Is there an orderly, comfortable living situation in the schools; is there purpose in children's learning?
- Is there a lack of tension?
- Are complaints of children by teachers no longer heard?

- Are comments like "these and those children," "the standards of our school are suffering," etc., being made?
- Is there an improved quality of parent-teacher relationships evident by almost total lack of parent complaints of prejudice, etc.?

Respondents were asked to rate each question from low or no (1) to high or yes (6) as they viewed their school now compared to last year. Results of these interviews are shown in Table 3.

EVALUATION OF TEACHER-LEADER TRAINING PROGRAM

Formative Evaluation

The effect of each inservice training session was rated on a five-point scale by the participants. The scale ranged from very effective (1) to very ineffective (5). They were also asked to list factors which contributed effectively and ineffectively to each inservice session. Results are shown as Table 4.

Summative Evaluation

This evaluation was done to provide information on the impact of the training sessions and the amount of personal growth that each participant had experienced as a consequence of his experience in

the human relations training workshops. One hundred questionnaires were sent to a random sampling of teachers who had participated in this phase of the program. Sixty-one completed questionnaires were returned. The number of responses, percentages, and total positive gain are shown in Table 5.

Table 3

Responses to Interviews on the Effectiveness of the Human Relations Program for 1974-75 in the Denver Public Schools

QUESTIONS	Low (No)	Average (Some)	High (Yes)
1. There is an orderly comfortable living situation in the school	13%	35%	52%
	*N = 71 Schools		
2. There is purpose in children's learning	9%	30%	61%
	N = 70 Schools		
3. There is still tension in the schools	54%	27%	19%
	N = 70 Schools		
4. Complaints about children by teachers are fewer than last year	21%	43%	35%
	N = 67 Schools		
5. (a) Comments like "these and those children" are being made	46%	30%	24%
	N = 67 Schools		
(b) Comments like "the standards of our school are suffering" are being made	48%	32%	20%
	N = 71 Schools		
6. There is an improved quality of parent-teacher relationship evident by an almost total lack of parent complaints of prejudice, etc.	14%	39%	47%
	N = 59 Schools		

*N = Number of Schools

Table 4

Evaluation of Teacher Leadership Workshop Held at George Washington High School on September 27, 1975

THE INSERVICE WAS:	VERY EFFECTIVE	84
	SOMEWHAT EFFECTIVE	125
	NEITHER	10
	SOMEWHAT INEFFECTIVE	5
	VERY INEFFECTIVE	1

1. List factors which contributed effectively to this inservice:

   a) Small groups/sharing of ideas/interaction/ group participation (89)

   b) Good planning/organization (43)

   c) Good facilitators (23)

   d) Good resource teacher/speakers (71)

   e) Good materials/content/available resources (37)

   f) Good bilingual-bicultural-multicultural activities (24)

   g) Good classroom management activities (17)

   h) Good techniques (7)

   i) Overall good meeting (2)

2. List factors which contributed ineffectively to this inservice:

   a) Less time for minor points (1)

   b) Time factor (40)

   c) Too much information in the time allotted (19)

   d) Groups too large (18)

e) Poor facilitators - lack of preparation (7)

f) Same material as last year (12)

g) The day of inservice (6)

h) Little group involvement (3)

i) Poor facilities at George Washington (14)

j) Geared toward elementary (12)

k) Too much lecturing (4)

l) Too much role-playing, less intergroup, too much sensitivity training (8)

3. Suggestions for improvement:

a) Have principals attend (56)

b) More material (5)

c) Variety of resource people (6)

d) More time needed (43)

e) Separate elementary, junior high, and senior high for next inservice program (5)

f) More small group interaction (14)

g) Inservices during regular day (12)

h) More advance notice (5)

i) Too large (smaller groups needed) (12)

j) Follow-up (5)

k) More talks - like Dee (7)

l) Definite, specific ways to improve people's relationships and implementation of program content for Human Relations Resource Committee (25)

Table 5

DENVER PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Office of Community Affairs
Human Relations Inservice Education Program
1974-1975

Teacher-Leader Training

EVALUATION

- NG indicates No Growth
- Numbers 1-4 indicate increasing degrees of personal growth

1. I am more aware of the school district as a social system that embraces all ethnic groups and cultures.

	NG	1	2	3	4
Number of Responses	10	11	12	15	7
Percentages*	18%	20%	22%	27%	13%
Total Positive Gain	82%				

2. I feel more secure in dealing with problems relative to school desegregation.

	NG	1	2	3	4
Number of Responses	10	9	12	13	9
Percentages	19%	17%	23%	24%	17%
Total Positive Gain	81%				

*Total percentage may not equal exactly 100 due to rounding.

3. I have improved in my understanding and perceptions of the range of problems that can occur in a desegregated school district.

	NG	1	2	3	4
Number of Responses	10	9	13	15	7
Percentages	19%	17%	24%	28%	13%
Total Positive Gain	81%				

4. I have gained knowledge of improved techniques of involving parents of all ethnic groups in the school district's program.

	NG	1	2	3	4
Number of Responses	10	13	13	15	3
Percentages	19%	24%	24%	28%	5%
Total Positive Gain	81%				

5. I feel better prepared to facilitate close communications between the school and home, particularly the homes of low achievers and those students with little or no profile in school.

	NG	1	2	3	4
Number of Responses	12	10	14	8	12
Percentages	21%	18%	25%	15%	21%
Total Positive Gain	79%				

6. I have gained greater knowledge of the dimensions of cultural differences among the people who make up the American society.

	NG	1	2	3	4
Number of Responses	11	7	15	13	9
Percentages	20%	13%	27%	23%	17%
Total Positive Gain	80%				

7. I have gained greater understanding of my own attitudes and behavior, as well as that of the students.

	NG	1	2	3	4
Number of Responses	8	7	13	15	13
Percentages	15%	13%	23%	27%	22%
Total Positive Gain	85%				

8. The insights gained into the attitudes and behavior of myself and the students can be utilized in the school setting.

	NG	1	2	3	4
Number of Responses	6	10	11	18	13
Percentages	10%	17%	19%	31%	22%
Total Positive Gain	80%				

9. I have taken the time to reappraise my own feelings with respect to myself, social class, race, colleagues, and school structure.

	NG	1	2	3	4
Number of Responses	4	7	9	22	13
Percentages	7%	13%	16%	40%	23%
Total Positive Gain	93%				

10. I am better prepared to help all students increase their own self understanding.

	NG	1	2	3	4
Number of Responses	7	7	12	19	9
Percentages	13%	13%	22%	35%	16%
Total Positive Gain	87%				

11. I am better prepared to utilize methods and techniques for creating a classroom environment that fosters acceptance and understanding.

	NG	1	2	3	4
Number of Responses	8	5	12	26	9
Percentages	13%	8%	20%	43%	15%
Total Positive Gain	87%				

12. I am more knowledgeable about the way in which students perceive themselves and others in a desegregated setting.

	NG	1	2	3	4
Number of Responses	10	7	16	18	9
Percentages	17%	12%	27%	30%	15%
Total Positive Gain	83%				

13. I am more adequately prepared to diagnose educational needs of students with differing abilities and backgrounds.

	NG	1	2	3	4
Number of Responses	11	9	15	18	7
Percentages	18%	15%	25%	30%	12%
Total Positive Gain	82%				

14. I have uncovered new ways to share newly gained knowledge with my colleagues who were not in the workshop.

	NG	1	2	3	4
Number of Responses	7	12	18	16	5
Percentages	12%	21%	31%	27%	9%
Total Positive Gain	88%				

15. I have gained greater knowledge of the dynamics of communication.

	NG	1	2	3	4
Number of Responses	6	9	18	18	9
Percentages	10%	15%	30%	30%	15%
Total Positive Gain	90%				

16. I am better equipped to facilitate communication between staff members.

	NG	1	2	3	4
Number of Responses	10	12	11	18	9
Percentages	16%	20%	18%	30%	15%
Total Positive Gain	84%				

17. I feel more comfortable in conversations with minority group persons.

	NG	1	2	3	4
Number of Responses	17	10	7	10	14
Percentages	30%	17%	12%	17%	24%
Total Positive Gain	70%				

18. I feel more adequately prepared to participate in planning and organizing programs which serve multicultural/multiracial education.

	NG	1	2	3	4
Number of Responses	11	11	12	18	8
Percentages	18%	18%	20%	30%	13%
Total Positive Gain	82%				

19. I feel better prepared to capitalize on opportunities to counteract prejudicial and stereotyped thinking in the classroom.

	NG	1	2	3	4
Number of Responses	9	9	12	19	11
Percentages	15%	15%	20%	32%	18%
Total Positive Gain	85%				

20. I believe that a teacher's actions communicate more graphically than words personal attitudes toward intergroup relations.

	NG	1	2	3	4
Number of Responses	5	1	6	19	27
Percentages	9%	2%	10%	33%	46%
Total Positive Gain	91%				

21. I believe I can be a group leader to facilitate change for others in my school in the next school year.

	NG	1	2	3	4
Number of Responses	10	9	11	11	15
Percentages	18%	16%	20%	20%	27%
Total Positive Gain	82%				

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Questionnaire results from the random sample of teachers, clerical staff members, and administrators showed that inservice activities provided many of the participants with improved communication skills that help them to understand and to relate to other people as individuals. Fifty-five percent of the elementary teachers who responded and 43 percent of the secondary teachers felt the inservice programs resulted in improved teacher-student relationships, while eight percent at each level did not form an opinion. Most administrators, 74 percent at the elementary and 79 percent at the secondary level, felt inservice programs result in improved staff-teacher relationships. Although many teachers and clerical staff members also felt that staff-teacher relationships were improved, the percent of each level for each group ranged from 43 to 52 percent, indicating these groups did not feel as strongly as did the administrators.

As a result of the inservice programs, 44 percent of the elementary teachers and 31 percent of the secondary teachers felt more secure in dealing with problems related to school desegregation. Approximately 15 percent at each level reported that they were not sure. Thirty-nine percent of the elementary administrators who completed surveys and 58 percent of the secondary administrators

responded positively to the same question. Positive results from the clerical staff at the elementary and secondary levels were 43 percent and 59 percent, respectively.

Greater understandings of pupil attitudes and behaviors were reported by some teachers as a result of the inservice program - elementary, 58 percent; secondary, 40 percent. Sixty-five percent and 54 percent of the teachers at corresponding levels said they felt better prepared to help pupils increase their own self-understanding. In addition, 64 percent and 48 percent, respectively, reported that they felt better prepared to utilize methods and techniques for creating an atmosphere that fosters acceptance and understanding of student differences.

Results of the interviews indicated that the overall school climate improved compared to last year. Ninety-one percent reported that there is purpose in children learning, while 54% felt that there was little or no tension in the schools. Eighty-six percent stated that parent-teacher relationships improved, although fifty-four percent felt that some complaints about children are still being made.

The report from the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare to the Denver Board of Education indicated that "the

inservice program involving professional and paraprofessional personnel seems to be pretty much on target. Elementary teachers seemed to be more responsive to the inservice program than the secondary teachers" (Appendix B).

The Community Education Council made the following report to the Courts:

> Interaction between administrators, teachers, students and parents has been uneven throughout the year, with similar uneven results. A late start, some resistance to any form of inservice program and difficulty in involving many parents have produced a program which is not yet showing results on the scale hoped for. It seems clear that inservice training must continue to be provided for all school personnel, parents and students, and that the program content must be improved to provide a challenge to those participating. The Council feels it is important for all those inolved to continue to learn about the integregation process, about other cultures, and particularly important for teachers to have the opportunity to exchange ideas concerning classroom management. This means continued and improved inservice training. (Appendix)

The teacher-leader evaluation indicated that participants made positive gain in personal growth ranging from 70% to 93%. On item 17 where 70% total positive gain was made, several respondents stated that this had never been a problem with them. Ninety-three percent indicated growth in their ability to reappraise their own feelings with respect to social class, race, colleagues, and school structure. Seventy-nine percent felt better prepared to facilitate close communications between the school and home, and

87% felt better prepared to help all students increase their own self understanding. Eighty-four percent felt better prepared to facilitate communication between staff members, while 82% felt more adequately prepared to plan and organize multicultural/ multiracial education programs. The overall growth indicated that the training sessions provided the teacher-leaders with a variety of valuable alternatives. Results seem to indicate that interpersonal relationships are best learned through activity and that active participants tend to be much more influenced by new roles than are passive participants in a communication process.

DISCUSSION

Inservice or human relations training is a key element of every human relations program. This activity is the most common of all human relations programs and is the one accepted as the most valid and valuable by almost all administrators and teachers. The purpose, generally, of this training is to make teachers and administrators aware of their attitudes and how these attitudes reflect themselves in the classroom and to bring about desired behavioral changes.

As the human relations program was developed and implemented within the district, in addition to the inservice training, three

other levels of application were considered:

- In the curriculum - The objective was to spur awareness of cultural differences and their positive value among students. Sample activities include such things as the elimination of stereotypes from classroom activities, intercultural exchange projects between schools, and bulletin board displays on ethnic variety (See guide).

- In personnel administration - The district's practices concerning hiring and firing, assignment on a nonsegregated basis, transfer, inservice training to develop awareness of biased attitudes (and to counter them, where possible) - all of these had to be examined.

- In community relations - Plans were devised to result in the improvement of communication between the schools and the community, and the resolution of tensions. Relations with other social agencies also came under this heading.

This practitioner was asked to respond to the Community Education Council's evaluation and subsequent report to the U. S. District Court as shown in Appendix B. A summary of that response is presented in the following two pages.

It was agreed that open lines of communication and basic understandings about the desegregation/integration process in our school system must continue to be developed and enlarged upon. Everyone involved must continue to be informed about the process of the Court-ordered desegregation in Denver.

A close examination of the results of the evaluation of the 1974-75 inservice activities indicated that staff, although desirous of continuing the inservice programs, was requesting specific kinds of programs designed to meet more individual needs. Every effort is being expended to design and implement programs that will meet these needs. A few respondents indicated that some inservice programs in the schools are, in all probability, reaching a saturation point for a variety of reasons, unrelated to the subject of the inservice activities.

Although initial inservice programs were not uniform and neither were the results, programs had great impact in many of the schools. Personnel, parents, and pupils of the Denver Public Schools are a heterogeneous cross section of the community and, in the opinion of this practitioner, responded in a very positive manner to the initial phases of the inservice education performed in this practicum in the 1974-75 school year.

Attitude adjustment and behavior modification, particularly in adults who have many beliefs, biases, and professional practices of long standing, is not a quick-and-easy process. It is the belief of this practitioner that the genuine acceptance of children by the staff of a school is a crucial factor in the quality of teaching and learning that will prevail. Where neighborhood populations change dramatically and quickly, especially where racial desegregation is a factor, staffs have difficulty in accepting children who seem different. The unknown gives rise to fears and insecurities.

Where schools change drastically, differences in the behavior of children are noted in the initial stages of transition. Fears that the academic and behavior standards of established schools will suffer are paramount. Most of these fears are rooted in feelings related to the unknown and to lack of association with the disadvantaged child and the child of another race. For this reason, future inservice activities must be more precisely targeted. Blanket activity for all employees on a superficial and hasty basis will not get the job done. Concentrated efforts will be focused on specific identified needs (See Guide, p. 48).

As a result of the foregoing report and of this practitioner's testimony in court, the federal judge directed counsel for the district and counsel for the plaintiffs to collaborate with this practitioner in preparing an updated program that could be signed into an order. This would insure the continuance of the program that was begun in the 1974-75 school year on a district-wide basis. The resultant program presented to the Court is shown as Appendix D. Subsequently, the U. S. District Court on August 22, 1975, decreed that, in order to ensure that teachers and other staff are adequately prepared and trained to work in an integrated setting, it is necessary to continue the inservice training for teachers and other staff in the area of human relations and cultural awareness which began in 1974.

All staff have been involved in five hours of inservice programs for the first semester of the 1975-76 school year. This practitioner has developed and will provide a program of two and one-half hours of inservice for all employees of the local school buildings as a part of the second semester five hours of mandatory inservice activity. A copy of this schedule is shown as Appendix E. The remaining two and one-half hours will be designed and implemented by each building's human relations resource committee utilizing the guide prepared as a part of this practicum.

What works for one school system may not, of course, work precisely for another. Nevertheless, this pratitioner would close by suggesting three principles that should be considered as part of any human relations program in the schools:

1. Planning should be centralized and formalized at the highest administrative level, where all intra-organizational contacts between the human relations program and other aspects of the educational system should be carried out.

2. Inservice training and attitudinal awareness are a key part of any human relations program and should be centrally implemented at the highest level; mechanisms must exist, however, for the central office to determine specialized needs in the schools (provided one starts to develop a strong human relations program in the schools before it is required by the Courts).

3. The day-to-day solving of human relations problems as it relates to individual schools should be left to those local bodies, which should have the power to make their decisions stick.

These are generalities, but they are based on accepted administrative procedures in many fields, and their validity in the area of human relations has been demonstrated many times in this practicum.

NATIONAL FOCUS

The Denver Public School system now serves as an example for other school districts and organizations, many of whom have asked for information about our human relations program as it relates to integration.

The Denver Public School system has acquired a national reputation (vis-a-vis Boston) in its successful implementation of the United States District Court Integration Order. To ascertain how this success was accomplished, inquiries have been received and some visits have been made by representatives of the public schools of Cincinnati and Cleveland, Ohio; Louisville, Kentucky; Phoenix and Tucson, Arizona; Oklahoma City, Oklahoma; Boston, Massachusetts; Detroit, Michigan; and Kansas City, Missouri; as well as Boston University and the National Neighbors Organization.

Because of the national scrutiny of the Denver Public Schools, it is necessary to provide answers on what effective inservice

training programs are and how they can be implemented involving all employees of the district.

Administrators from fourteen school districts met in Denver in November, 1975, for a three-day seminar on desegregating schools with the Denver Public Schools serving as the host. At this seminar, sponsored by the American Institute for Research, an in-depth presentation was made by this practitioner on the human relations program in the Denver Public Schools. A copy of the guide prepared as a part of this practicum was presented to each district in attendance which included Boston, Detroit, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Dayton, Indianapolis, Louisville, Baltimore, Kansas City, Omaha, Wilmington, Portland, and San Francisco.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

1) Because of the limited time available for testing and the limitations of a paper and pencil test in measuring attitudes and interpersonal behavior, the amount of change that has occurred based on the implementation of this program may not be truly reflected.

2) The difficulties in studying any treatment process of this kind are legion: vagueness in outcomes, imprecisely described

processes. absent or noncomparable control groups, measures which sensitize the subjects, and failure to specify a clear theoretical basis for predictions made. When the product of a process is change in persons, the criterion problem is ordinarily a major one, whether the treatment occupies the domain of education, mental health, or social functioning.

SUMMARY

The intergroup education program provided inservice training to personnel in the Denver Public Schools. The objectives of the inservice activities were to improve the communication skills of administrators, teachers, clerical staff members, and bus drivers so that they could relate effectively with pupils, school personnel, parents, and other-community members. Inservice programs for teachers also were designed to improve skills in diagnosing classroom tension and problems and to provide ideas for resolution. Five specially trained teachers, working with this practitioner in the Office of Community Affairs, were available to aid school staffs in planning and/or conducting inservice activities. Several other Denver Public School employees were utilized as consultants and conducted many of the inservice sessions. At least five hours of inservice training were received by most personnel. Some schools

planned additional inservice activities, which were approved within the limits of the staff development budget. After these funds were depleted, inservices planned for half-day teacher release hours and/or for faculty meetings.

The program involved 205 inservice training sessions from August, 1974, to June, 1975. The effectiveness of each inservice session was rated on a five-point scale by the participants. Results indicated that 192 inservice activities were considered very effective or somewhat effective, while 13 sessions were rated as being neither effective nor ineffective.

A questionnaire designed by this practitioner was sent to a sample of teachers, administrators, and clerical personnel. Lunchroom and custodial personnel also were sampled with the questionnaire and results for these groups are given in the preceding section of this report.

Although this summary refers to administrators, teachers, and clerical staff members, school bus drivers and aides rated their inservice programs as being effective.

It seems apparent that the inservice programs elicited positive reactions from many of the district employees. Efforts

to accomplish the program objectives were continuous throughout the school year. Those responsible for planning and implementing inservice training worked to be creatively responsive to the needs of school personnel. Ratings and comments from each inservice were utilized to improve subsequent activities whenever possible.

CONCLUSIONS

After reviewing the data in this report, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. Evaluations of the inservice programs in the schools indicated substantial gains in several areas of human relations.

2. Improvements in intergroup relations over last year were indicated by a random sampling of school personnel.

3. The overall purpose of this practicum - to design and implement a long-range human relations program in the district - was accomplished.

4. Teacher-leaders gained in several skills designed to increase their awareness of human relations concepts to the point that they could become leaders in their respective schools.

5. The data support findings by other researchers cited in the literature.

6. A viable intergroup education program was developed and implemented in the Denver Public Schools.

7. A guide was prepared and disseminated to each school to provide assistance in implementing each local building human relations program.

APPENDIX C

OFFICE OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS
DENVER PUBLIC SCHOOLS
General Administration

TO: _____

FROM: Evie G. Dennis, Community Specialist EGD

DATE: May 7, 1975

SUBJECT: Evaluation of Implementation of Preparation for Integration, Staff, Parents, Students (ZB III)

The Office of Community Affairs is seeking to establish the degree of effectiveness of activities directed toward implementation of integration in the schools. These activities comprised the various things your staff did to help achieve the goal of quality education through integration directed by ZB III of the court ordered integration plan.

You were chosen to participate in this evaluation through the process of a scientific random sampling. We would appreciate a few moments of your time to respond to the following questionnaire. Add any comments you wish, and return the questionnaire to your principal by May 30, 1975. Remove this sheet so that your response will be anonymous.

Approved: Carle E. Stenmark

DENVER PUBLIC SCHOOLS
GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

Office of Community Affairs

The Office of Community Affairs would like your opinion regarding the value and effectiveness of the implementation of the plan - Preparation For Integration, Staff, Parents, Students. Would you please complete this questionnaire and return it to this office by Friday, May 30, 1975.

Directions: Encircle the numeral beside each question that best represents your opinion. Please feel free to add any comments you might want to make.

Administrator 1
Teacher 2
Clerical 3
Lunchroom 4
Custodial 5

1. In general, I feel that school employees were helped by the inservice programs.

Strongly Agree 1
Agree 2
No Opinion 3
Disagree 4
Strongly Disagree 5

2. To what extent do you feel teacher-student relationships were improved by the inservice activities designed to promote these relationships.

Great 1
Somewhat 2
No Opinion 3
Little 4
Not at all 5

If you encircled 4 or 5, please explain the problems.

---

3. To what extent do you feel staff-teacher relationships were improved.

Great 1
Somewhat 2
No Opinion 3
Little 4
Not at all 5

4. The inservice programs need further follow-up if they are to be of any value.

Strongly Agree 1
Agree 2
No Opinion 3
Disagree 4
Strongly Disagree 5

5. To what extent are programs on interpersonal relationships valuable to you in your situation?

Great 1
Somewhat 2
No Opinion 3
Little 4
Not at all 5

6.	As a result of the inservice programs, to what extent do you feel that your fellow workers communicate with more openness?	Great Somewhat No Opinion Little Not at all	1 2 3 4 5
7.	To what extent do you feel that you have input into the planning and/or conducting of activities in your building?	Great Somewhat No Opinion Little Not at all	1 2 3 4 5
8.	To what extent did the inservices help you to understand and relate to other people as individuals?	Great Somewhat No Opinion Little Not at all	1 2 3 4 5
9.	To what extent did the inservices help create a more unified group in your area of responsibility?	Great Somewhat No Opinion Little Not at all	1 2 3 4 5
10.	To what extent did the inservices meet your personal needs in your job situation?	Great Somewhat No Opinion Little Not at all	1 2 3 4 5

If you circled 4 or 5 above, please explain the problem.

_____

_____

11.	To what extent have you become more aware of the school district as a social system that embraces all ethnic groups and cultures?	Great Somewhat No Opinion Little Not at all	1 2 3 4 5
12.	As a result of the inservice programs, to what extent do you feel more secure in dealing with problems related to school desegregation?	Great Somewhat No Opinion Little Not at all	1 2 3 4 5
13.	To what extent have you gained greater knowledge of the dimensions of cultural differences among the people who make up the American society?	Great Somewhat No Opinion Little Not at all	1 2 3 4 5

14.	To what extent have you gained greater understanding of your own attitudes and behaviors, as a result of the inservice programs?	Great 1 Somewhat 2 No Opinion 3 Little 4 Not at all 5
15.	To what extent have you gained greater understanding of your students' attitudes and behaviors, as a result of the inservice programs?	Great 1 Somewhat 2 No Opinion 3 Little 4 Not at all 5
16.	To what extent have you taken the time to reflect upon your feelings with respect to social class, race, colleagues, and social structure?	Great 1 Somewhat 2 No Opinion 3 Little 4 Not at all 5
17.	To what extent do you feel better prepared to help students increase their own self-understanding?	Great 1 Somewhat 2 No Opinion 3 Little 4 Not at all 5
18.	To what extent do you feel better prepared to utilize methods and techniques for creating an environment that fosters acceptance and understanding of students' individual differences?	Great 1 Somewhat 2 No Opinion 3 Little 4 Not at all 5
19.	To what extent do you feel better prepared to utilize methods and techniques for creating an environment that fosters acceptance and understanding of other adults with whom you work?	Great 1 Somewhat 2 No Opinion 3 Little 4 Not at all 5
20.	To what extent do you feel that you are more adequately prepared to participate in planning and organizing programs which serve multicultural/ multiracial education?	Great 1 Somewhat 2 No Opinion 3 Little 4 Not at all 5
21.	To what extent do you feel that you are better prepared to take advantage of opportunities to counteract prejudicial and stereotyped thinking?	Great 1 Somewhat 2 No Opinion 3 Little 4 Not at all 5
22.	To what extent do you feel that you could be a group leader to bring about change for others next year?	Great 1 Somewhat 2 No Opinion 3 Little 4 Not at all 5

23. I feel that the local school resource committee was necessary this year.

Strongly Agree 1
Agree 2
No Opinion 3
Disagree 4
Strongly Disagree 5

24. I feel that the local school resource committee should be an active, operating committee for next year.

Strongly Agree 1
Agree 2
No Opinion 3
Disagree 4
Strongly Disagree 5

25. I feel that the primary need for inservice education, related to honest and effective integration of all groups within the system, could be best fulfilled by a workshop in the following areas: (Please describe)

26. The most beneficial inservice program in which I participated was:

_____

27. The least valuable inservice program was:

_____

28. To what extent were you prepared for the 1974-75 opening of school as required by the Court Order?

Great 1
Somewhat 2
No Opinion 3
Little 4
Not at all 5

29. <u>For non-teaching-staff only</u>: As a result of the inservice activities, to what extent do you feel that there is a closer relationship to the total staff.

Great 1
Somewhat 2
No Opinion 3
Little 4
Not at all 5

APPENDIX D

DENVER PUBLIC SCHOOLS
DIVISION OF EDUCATION
Department of Elementary Education

ORIENTATION/MOTIVATION AND
STAFF DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES
FOR 1975-76

BJECTIVES	PRIOR ACTIVITY	CONTINUING ACTIVITY	RESOURCE CENTRAL & LOCAL SCHOOL	IMPLEMENTATION DATES
ORIENTATION/MOTIVATION				
Pupil				
New students will be oriented to each school of attendance	X	X	Teachers and Principal	School year 1974-75 School year 1975-76
Kindergarten students will visit paired school for orientation	NO	X	Principal Staff Lunchroom Staff Transportation	June 75 - limited participation Second semester 1976
Students will be provided activities to unite, motivate and join students together (e.g., picnics, carnivals, holiday programs)	X	X	Principal Staff Parents Dept. of El. Ed. Transportation Federal Funds	School year 1974-75 School year 1975-76
Student Councils will work actively to promote joint school spirit and student leadership	X	X	Principal Sponsor Transportation	School year 1974-75 School year 1975-76
Parents				
Paired schools will provide parents an opportunity to serve on liaison committees established by each pairing	X	X	Principal Staff Parents	School year 1974-75 School year 1975-76
Schools will provide parents parents an opportunity to serve on the School Budget Advisory Committees	X	X	Principal Staff Parents Community Central	School year 1974-75 School year 1975-76
Parents will be invited to visit paired schools for orientation	X	X	Principal Staff Clerical Transportation Federal Funds	School year 1974-75 School year 1975-76

Registration activities will be provided in all schools (get acquainted)	X	X	Principal Staff Parents Clerical	School year 1974-75 School year 1975-76
Schools will provide letters of information to parents	X	X	Principal Clerical Dept. of El. Ed.	School year 1974-75 School year 1975-76
Schools will provide periodic newsletters to parents, these will be sent home by school	X	X	Principal Clerical	School year 1974-75 School year 1975-76
All paired school parents will be informed of pairing cycles, transportation schedules, and their involvement	X	X	Principal Clerical	School year 1974-75 School year 1975-76
All schools will have a Human Relations Committee composed of teachers, administrators and parents	X	X	Principal Staff Parents Central Community	School year 1974-75 School year 1975-76
Special meetings which offer greater opportunity for parent involvement in the total academic school life will be provided, e.g., Back to School Night, Parent-Teacher Conferences, orientation to new and existing academic programs, group discussion or clarification groups	X	X	Principal Staff Central Transportation U.S. postage Federal Funds	School year 1974-75 School year 1975-76
Special parent informal activities will be provided to orient, inform, and aide them with school functions, more on the social side, e.g., open house, cracker barrel discussion, coffees, childrens' programs	X	X	Principal Staff	School year 1974-75 School year 1975-76
Schools will provide school information handbooks for parents	Limited	X	Principal Staff Parents	Early first semester 1974-75 Early first semester 1975-76

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Paired school principals will meet monthly to discuss, plan, and refine administrative and instructional elements of paired schools	X	X	Principal Dept's of: Pupil Services Elementary Ed. Instructional Services Transportation Health Services	School year 1974-75 School year 1975-76
Satellite school principals will meet periodically to discuss, plan and refine administrative and instructional elements of these schools	X	X	Same as above	School year 1974-75 School year 1975-76
Rezoned school principals will meet periodically to discuss, plan, and refine administrative and instructional elements of these schools	Limited	X	Same as above	School year 1974-75 School year 1975-76
Special (Bilingual Educ.) school faculties will meet on a periodic basis to discuss, plan and refine administrative and instructional elements of these schools	X	X	Principal Staff Dept's of: Instructional Services Elementary Ed. Consultants Federal Funds	School year 1974-75 School year 1975-76
Paired school faculties will develop a joint planning committee which will meet regularly to assist with planning and coordination of instructional activities	X	X	Principal Staff	School year 1974-75 School year 1975-76
Paired school faculties will convene joint faculty meetings and other planning sessions on a regular basis	X	X	Principal Staff	School year 1974-75 School year 1975-76
Paired schools will provide opportunity for exchange teaching and teacher observation	X	X	Principal	School year 1974-75 School year 1975-76
Opportunities will be provided for staff visitations to schools in and outside the school district	X	X	Principal Central	School year 1974-75 School year 1975-76

Inservice activities are provided for teachers in many areas, where appropriate:	X	X	Principal Staff Central DPS Funds State Funds Federal Funds	School year 1974-75 School year 1975-76

Title I - ESEA
- . Diagnostic Teaching Center Program
- . Early Childhood Program
- . Extended Learning Day Program
- . Home Education Language Program
- . Primary Math Program

Title IV - ESAA
- . Teacher Inservice Center (1975-76)
- . Youth Orientation & Motivation (1974-76)
- . ZB III (1974-75)
- . Bilingual

State
- . HB1164 - Teacher Inservice (1974-75)
  Individual - selected schools
- . CARE Teacher Inservice (HB1164, 1975-76)
  Individual Teacher Teams - selected schools

DPS
- . Reading Package
- . Compensated Inservice for individual teachers - Dept. of Instructional Services
- . Program for School Excellence - selected schools
- . Citywide Curriculum offerings
  - . Art
  - . IMC
  - . Music
  - . Special Education
  - . Mathematics
  - . English
  - . Formal English
  - . Social Studies
  - . Science
  - . Balarat (Outdoor Education)
  - . Cultural Arts Program
  - . Physical Education
  - . Performing Arts
- . Individual school planned programs for professional growth (faculty meetings, early dismissal planning days)
- . New Teachers
  - . Pre-service
  - . On-going required (20 hours)
- . Paid attendance at local or regional professional workshops and national conventions

STAFF DEVELOPMENT (continued)

The following are activities which will be implemented during the 1975-76 school year:

Staff members in elementary schools will increase their awareness of the uniqueness of students and become proficient in the utilization of such differences in developing a feeling of unity.

1. Individually tailored inservice programs designed to meet the needs of the school will be developed by a human relations committee comprising, among others, those with special intergroup relations training provided for representatives from all schools during spring, 1975.	ESAA and DPS	September, 1975
2. Onsite visitations by representatives from the Division of Education to assist in assessing the effectiveness of individual school programs.	DPS	September, 1975 June, 1976
3. Continuing self assessment of individual school program by staff members within each school with strong emphasis on the human relations committee.	ESAA and DPS	February, 1976 June, 1976
4. Restructuring of individual inservice programs as need is evidenced through a variety of assessments by building staff or by applying the discrepancy model concept to the program.	ESAA Title IV	September, 1975 June, 1976
5. Specially designed inservice workshops for program leaders and others at inservice centers.		

To develop in all members of the school community an understanding of the unique cultures and life styles of various people and the common purpose of schools in the growth of young people to adulthood.

1. School staffs will have available and will utilize a guide for intergroup education which is being developed by Mrs. Dennis.		September, October, 1975

STAFF DEVELOPMENT (continued)

2. **Building staffs will design activities which promote intercultural understanding activities such as, but not limited to:** — **No extra funding required**

   . Mexican Independence Day — September, 1975
   .. Martin Luther King programs — May, 1975
   . Black Awareness
   . Heritage Day

CONCLUSION

A needs assessment was performed to gain precise staff development target areas for the 1975-76 school year.

Following are the areas receiving the greatest attention by school faculties for the coming year:

Cultural differences, awareness, values; minority cultures/multicultural; bilingual-bicultural

Communications skills - role assessment, role playing, etc.

Workshops involving parents-teachers-students for improving relationships

Values clarification

Closer coordination, workshops, problem solving between paired schools

Human relations

Individualizing instructions

How to improve student's self-image, confidence, etc.

Discipline

Staff development - better understanding between teacher-teacher and teacher-administrator

/cbr
8/15/75

Division of Education
Department of Secondary Education

PLAN FOR ORIENTATION, MOTIVATION AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT FOR 1975-1976 SCHOOL YEAR

ORIENTATION/MOTIVATION

Objectives	Activities	Resources	Implementation Date
Schools will utilize a broad base of input in developing comprehensive plans for orientation to the new school setting.	1. Staff representatives within each building (including those with special leadership training received under Mrs. Dennis) will serve on a committee to plan orientation and motivation activities.	Substitutes and extra pay for extra work. DPS-possible ESAA	February, March April, 1975
	2. Student government and other student representatives will contribute their ideas to the orientation/motivation program.	Refreshments School incidental funds	February, March April, 1975
	3. PTSA and other parents will provide suggestions for effective approaches to orientation/motivation-socials, telephoning, etc.	Refreshments School incidental or PTSA funds. Papers, printing other materials-DPS	February, March April, 1975
	4. Reassessment of the orientation/motivation plan with necessary adjustments made in view of changing needs.	DPS or ESAA funds for substitutes or extra pay for teachers involved.	September, Octobe November, 1975

Objectives	Activities	Resources	Implementation Date
To assist parents of new students to develop an understanding of the new school environment, program and activities. As a result, parents will encourage students to become active, constructive participants in the school.	1. Initial contacts with parents of new students will be established through meetings in the contributing schools, in the community, or visits to the new school.	School incidental or PTSA funds	Prior to June, 1975
	2. Follow up contacts to provide additional information and to respond to concerns expressed by parents. . telephone tree by PTSA and/or staff members. . meetings in receiving school. . social activities such as picnics or box suppers.	School incidental or PTSA funds	June, 1975 September, 1975 some activities September, 1975 June, 1976
	3. Mailings or other distribution of information about school opening, procedures, policies, clubs and activities.	Regular DPS funds	August, 1975
	4. PTSA and other parent involvement in school activities.	No extra funding required	September, 1975 June, 1976

Objectives	Activities	Resources	Implementation Date
To involve new students in programs and activities which will increase their feelings of being an active participant in the new school setting.	1. Initiate contact with contributing school through:	No extra funding required	
	. Administrator visits to meet with students in contributing schools.		March, 1975
	. counselor visits to meet with small groups of students in contributing schools.		April, 1975
	. student representatives to meet with new students in contributing schools.		May, 1975
	2. Meetings for ninth grade students in each junior high school to inform boys and girls of the opportunities available in all high schools to participate in interscholastic athletics.	No extra funding required	May, 1975
	3. Provide for visitation of new students to the receiving school to familiarize them with the physical plant and the staff.	Transportation DPS & ESAA	
	. evening get-togethers in the receiving school.		May, 1975
	. daytime visits to the receiving school.		August, 1975
	4. Junior high students who have participated in the leadership camp will be involved in orientation programs.	No extra funding required	August, 1975
	5. Counselors and administrators on hand to counsel with new students and parents.	No extra funding required	August 20-27, 1975
	6. Varied orientation activities to meet the needs in each school will be conducted on the first day for new students.	No extra funding required	September 3,4 1975

Objectives	Activities	Resources	Implementation Date
	7. A variety of extra curricular activities such as: . socials or dances . interscholastic athletics . clubs such as: science club, red cross, model car club, bowling club, etc.	Regular DPS program funds	September 8,1975 thru May, 1976
	8. Involvement of student representatives in developing plans and projects to make school a desirable place to be through: . assemblies . art shows . all school activites within the school day	Regular DPS funds	September, 1975 June, 1976

Objectives	Activities	Resources	Implementation Date
• To develop in all members of the school community an understanding of the unique cultures and life styles of various people and the common purpose of schools in the growth of young people to adulthood.	• 1. School staffs will have available and will utilize a guide for intergroup education which is being developed by Mrs. Dennis.		September, October, 1975
	. 2. Building staffs will design activities which promote intercultural understanding activities such as, but not limited to:	No extra funding required	
	. Mexican Independence Day . Martin Luther King programs . Black Awareness . Heritage Day		September, 1975 May, 1976
	3. Promote activities which relate education to the adulthood	DPS State and Federal funding	School year 1975-76
	. career fairs. . exploratory programs in career. . Executive Intern Program. . visits to industry. . Cooperative Education programs.		

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Objectives	Activities	Resources	Implementation Date
Staff members in secondary schools will increase their awareness of the uniqueness of students and become proficient in the utilization of such differences in developing a feeling of unity.	1. Individually tailored inservice programs designed to meet the needs of the school will be developed by a staff resource committee comprising, among others, those with special intergroup relations training provided for representatives from all schools during spring, 1975.	ESAA and DPS	September, 1975
	2. Onsite visitations by representatives from the Division of Education to assist in assessing the effectiveness of individual school programs.	DPS	September, 1975 June, 1976
	3. Continuing self assessment of individual school program by staff members within each school with strong emphasis on the resource committee.	ESAA and DPS ~~Title IV~~	February, 1976 June, 1976
	4. Restructuring of individual inservice programs as need is evidenced through a variety of assessments by building staff or by applying the discrepancy model concept to the program.	ESAA Title IV	September, 1975 June, 1976
	5. Specially designed inservice workshops for program leaders and others at inservice centers.		

Objectives	Activities	Resources	Implementation Date
To expand instructional approaches to meet the broad spectrum of student needs	1. Staff development programs at school district inservice center specially designed to meet needs of each group of educators who attend the training sessions.	ESAA	September, 1975 to June, 1976
	2. Project CARE will include demonstration and modeling of techniques to be mastered by staff participants in promoting: . skills to maximize learning. . lesson planning skills. . individualizing for student needs. . classroom management skills.	HB 1164, DPS	October, 1975
	3. Each school will develop and conduct a twenty-hour inservice program for teachers new to the Denver Public Schools.	DPS	September, 1975 April, 1976
	4. Each building designs staff development programs aimed at improved instruction through . department meetings. . building instruction committee.	No extra funding required	September, 1975 April, 1976

APPENDIX E

DENVER PUBLIC SCHOOLS
INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMUNICATION

TO: ALL PRINCIPALS

FROM: Evie G. Dennis and Roscoe L. Davidson

DATE: January 16, 1976

SUBJECT: Human Relations/Cultural Awareness Inservice Programs for Second Semester - (1976) - Information and Schedules

This communication relates to the one sent you earlier, dated January 6.

. Five hours of inservice training - two and one-half hours of the required five hours of inservice training for second semester will be provided for the entire district by the Office of Community Affairs on the early dismissal days indicated in the attached schedule.

. Your school will be dismissed early on the dates shown and you and your total staff should report to the building indicated on the attached schedule. Each school should be covered by one person in the office and at least one custodian. Principals should then arrange for these employees to attend one of the other sessions in the series, thus providing for all staff to become involved in the program. Food service should be handled by each school as on any other early dismissal day. Please confirm your plans with Mrs. Margaret Benton.

. Excursions - Those excursions already approved will be accommodated, however, further request for excursions on the dates of the inservice program should be avoided.

. Evaluation - Evaluation forms will be provided just before the close of each session, and will be collected at that time and tabulated by the Office of Community Affairs.

. Teacher-leaders from Human Relations Resource Committee - Special morning sessions will be provided according to the attached schedule for your

teacher-leaders. Substitute teachers will be provided, therefore principals will need to communicate to Dr. Barbara Dwight at 399-1167 or 399-1168 what substitutes are needed.

. Make-up sessions will not be provided by the Office of Community Affairs and must be handled by each building. Each building administrator will be responsible for verification of attendance of all staff. Principals will need to include an accounting of absences and reasons for same in the report that is due in the Departments of Elementary and Secondary Education ten days after the close of the semester (June 25, 1976). Copies of the report forms are attached.

. It is necessary that all steps are taken to inform each school community about the early dismissal day, the reasons for same and the outstanding list of consultants that will be involved. Good PR is important.

. Since all of the arrangements have been made, you do not need to fill out the usual request form for early dismissal.

RLD:EGD/dlf

cc: Dr. Kishkunas
Mr. Stenmark
Dr. Brzeinski
Mr. Oliver
Mr. Thomas
Mr. Shannon

attachment

SCHEDULE OF SECOND SEMESTER - 1976 - INSERVICE PROGRAMS

DR. RICHARD O. ULIBARRI - CONSULTANT

DATE: Thursday, February 19, 1976
TIME: 12:30 - 3:00 p.m.
PLACE: Merrill Junior High School

SCHOOLS: Merrill, Morey, Place, Rishel

DR. RICHARD ULIBARRI - CONSULTANT

DATE: Friday, February 20, 1976
TIME: 12:30 - 3:00 p.m.
PLACE: Smiley Junior High School

SCHOOLS: Skinner, Smiley, Dahlia Ext., Federal Ext., Hampden Ext., Sheridan Ext., Shoshone Ext., Welton Ext., 31st Ext.

DR. RICHARD ULIBARRI - CONSULTANT

DATE: Monday, February 23, 1976
TIME: 1:45 - 3:45 p.m.
PLACE: North High School

SCHOOLS: Slavens, Stevens, Swansea, Teller, Thatcher, Valverde, Westwood, Whiteman, Wyman

DR. CHARLES GALLOWAY - CONSULTANT

DATE: Friday, March 5, 1976
TIME: 1:15 - 3:45 p.m.
PLACE: West High School

SCHOOLS: Bromwell, Brown, Carson, Cheltenham, Colfax, College View, Columbian, Cowell, Del Pueblo, Ebert, Edison, Ellsworth, Emerson, Garden Place.

DR. MORRIS MASSEY - CONSULTANT

DATE: Thursday, March 11, 1976
TIME: 1:15 - 3:45 p.m.
PLACE: South High School

SCHOOLS: Ford, Godsman, Goldrick, Holm, Kaiser, Knapp, McKinley, Montbello, Montclair, Munroe, Newlon.

DR. MORRIS MASSEY - CONSULTANT

DATE: Friday, March 12, 1976
TIME: 12:30 - 3:00 p.m.
PLACE: Hill Junior High School

SCHOOLS: Grant, Hamilton, Hill.

DR. ALVIN GOLDBERG - CONSULTANT

DATE: Friday, March 19, 1976
TIME: 1:15 - 3:45 p.m.
PLACE: Baker Junior High School

SCHOOLS: Amesse, Valdez, Ashley, Barnum, Beach Court, Belmont, Boettcher, Boulevard, Bradley

DR. PATRICIA BIDOL - CONSULTANT

DATE: Friday, March 26, 1976
TIME: 1:15 - 3:45 p.m.
PLACE: Hill Junior High School

SCHOOLS: Ash Grove, Cory, Hallett, Barrett, Knight, Columbine, University Park, Ellis, Harrington, Wyatt, Fallis, McMeen, Smith, Stedman, Washington Park.

DR. FREDERICK HOLLIDAY - CONSULTANT

DATE: Thursday, April 1, 1976
TIME: 12:00 - 2:30 p.m.
PLACE: George Washington High School

SCHOOLS: A. Lincoln, East, George Washington, JFK, West

DR. FREDERICK HOLLIDAY - CONSULTANT

DATE: Friday, April 2, 1976
TIME: 12:00 - 2:30 p.m.
PLACE: Manual High School

SCHOOLS: Manual, North, South, Thomas Jefferson, Metro Youth Education Center.

DR. CHARLES GALLOWAY - CONSULTANT

DATE: Thursday, April 8, 1976
TIME: 1:15 - 3:45 p.m.
PLACE: Abraham Lincoln High School

SCHOOLS: Alcott, Smedley, Asbury, Whittier, Berkeley, Remington, Bryant-Webster, Gust, Crofton, Steele, Denison, Force, Mitchell, Doull, Eagleton, Fairmont, Lincoln, Gilpin, Johnson, Greenlee, Fairview, Traylor.

DR. CHARLES GALLOWAY - CONSULTANT

DATE: Friday, April 9, 1976
TIME: 12:30 - 3:00 p.m.
PLACE: Kepner Junior High School

SCHOOLS: Henry, Kepner, Kunsmiller, Lake, Horace Mann

DR. MARK CHESLER - CONSULTANT

DATE: Thursday, April 22, 1976
TIME: 1:15 - 3:45 p.m.
PLACE: Hill Junior High School

SCHOOLS: Moore, Oakland, Palmer, Park Hill, Philips, Pitts, Rosedale, Sabin, Samuels, Schenck, Schmitt, Sherman, Steck.

DR. MARK CHESLER - CONSULTANT

DATE: Friday, April 23, 1976
TIME: 1:15 - 3:45 p.m.
PLACE: Baker Junior High School

SCHOOLS: Baker, Byers, Cole, Gove

SPECIAL TRAINING SESSIONS FOR TEACHER-LEADERS
ON HUMAN RELATIONS RESOURCE COMMITTEE

DR. RICHARD ULIBARRI - CONSULTANT

DATE: February 20, 1976
TIME: 8:00 - 10:30 a.m.
PLACE: Inservice Center

SCHOOLS: Bromwell, Brown, Carson, Cheltenham, Colfax, College View, Columbian, Cowell, Del Pueblo, Ebert, Edison, Ellsworth, McKinley, Moore, Montbello, Montclair, Munroe, Newlon, Oakland, Palmer, Park Hill, Philips, Pitts, Rosedale, Sabin, Samuels, Schenck, Schmitt, Sherman, Steck.

DR. CHARLES GALLOWAY - CONSULTANT

DATE: March 5, 1976
TIME: 8:00 - 10:30 a.m.
PLACE: Inservice Center

SCHOOLS: A. Lincoln, East, George Washington, JFK, Manual, Metro Youth Education Center, North, South, Thomas Jefferson, West.

DR. FREDERICK HOLLIDAY - CONSULTANT

DATE: April 1, 1976
TIME: 8:00 - 10:30 a.m.
PLACE: Inservice Center

SCHOOLS: Baker, Byers, Cole, Gove, Grant, Hamilton, Hill, Henry, Horace Mann, Kepner, Kunsmiller, Lake, Merrill, Morey, Place, Rishel, Skinner, Smiley. Dahlia Ext., Federal Ext., Hampden Ext., Sheridan Ext., Shoshone Ext., Welton Ext., 31st Ext.

DR. CHARLES GALLOWAY - CONSULTANT

DATE: April 8, 1976
TIME: 8:00 - 10:30 a.m.
PLACE: Inservice Center

SCHOOLS: Ash Grove, Ashley, Amesse, Barnum, Barrett, Beach Court, Belmont, Boettcher, Boulevard, Bradley, Columbine, Cory, Ellis, Fallis, Ford, Godsman, Goldrick, Hallett, Harrington, Holm, Kaiser, Knapp, Knight, McMeen, Smith, Stedman, University Park, Valdez, Washington Park, Wyatt.

DR. MARK A. CHESLER - CONSULTANT

DATE: April 23, 1976
TIME: 8:00 - 10:30 a.m.
PLACE: Inservice Center

SCHOOL: Alcott, Asbury, Berkeley, Bryant-Webster, Crofton, Denison, Doull, Eagleton, Emerson, Fairmont, Fairview, Force, Garden Place, Gilpin, Greenlee, Gust, Johnson, Lincoln, Mitchell, Remington, Slavens, Smedley, Steele, Stevens, Swansea, Teller, Thatcher, Traylor, Valverde, Westwood, Whiteman, Whittier, Wyman.

CONSULTANT FOR SECOND SEMESTER (1976) INSERVICE PROGRAMS

DR. PATRICIA BIDOL is Chairman of the Department of Education at the National College of Education in Chicago. She was the former Superintendent of Schools in Baldwin, Michigan. Dr. Bidol has conducted workshops for educators in 30 states designed to develop ways in which schools and other institutions can begin to practice pluralism. She is author of a curriculum for secondary students, New Perspectives on Race.

FREDERICK DOUGLASS HOLLIDAY is the superintendent of the York, Pennsylvania City Schools. Mr. Holliday has been a consultant to the United States Office of Education and has lectured widely on the subject of the poor throughout the United States. He received his Doctorate from Harvard University; his Master's and Baccaulaureate Degrees from Temple University.

RICHARD O. ULIBARRI is Professor of History and Dean of Continuing Education, Weber State College, Odgen, Utah. He has lectured widely in the areas of institutional racism, definition of minorities and culture, and the importance of poverty. Dr. Ulibarri has been a consultant to numerous organizations such as the United States Office of Education, Intermountain Forest Service, public schools in Odgen and Salt Lake, Utah Police Academy, and the Thiokol Corporation. He has written several articles on the history of minorities. Dr. Ulibarri received his B.A. and Ph.D. from the University of Utah.

MARK CHESLER is Associate Professor, Department of Sociology, University of Michigan and Project Director, Community Resources Ltd., Ann Arbor, Michigan. He has worked for several years in the areas of human relations and cultural awareness. His work has ranged from retraining programs for teachers and administrators to group organizing efforts with students and parental population. The focus has been on anti-racism and anti-sexism, new organizational procedures, alternative learning systems, organizational development, student/ community control, etc. He holds the Ph.D. in Social Psychology from the University of Michigan, M.A. in Psychology from Hofstra University, and the B.A. in Industrial and Labor Relations from Cornell University. His impressive list of publications approximates 70 articles and books on a variety of subjects such as educational change, desegregation and integration in schools, alternative education, crises in the schools, teacher training.

ALVIN GOLDBERG is Professor and Chairman of the Speech Communication Department, University of Denver, has done extensive work in the area of communication and has several publications on this subject. He holds the Ph.D. degree from Northwestern, the M.A. from the University of Hawaii, and the B.A. from Wayne State.

CHARLES M. GALLOWAY is Professor of Curriculum and Foundations in the College of Education at Ohio State University and is an expert on that which is left unsaid - Nonverbal communication. He has taught at the elementary and secondary education levels, worked as an assistant principal, and currently is a consultant to a number of school systems in the United States. In addition to his expertise in nonverbal communication, Dr. Galloway has done considerable research in teaching styles and has given numerous speeches and workshops on personalized teaching, individualized instruction, management practices and supervision. He is editor of "Theory Into Practice", a professional journal published by the College of Education at Ohio State. He received the Doctor of Education Degree from the University of Florida in 1962.

MORRIS E. MASSEY is Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies, College of Business, University of Colorado at Boulder. He has been at the University since 1967, and has received three university awards for teaching excellence. Originally from Waco, Texas, he received his undergraduate and M.B.A. degrees from the University of Texas, and his Ph.D. from LSU. Among the numerous groups and companies he has presented programs to are: Pepsi Cola, Motorola Institute, United States Chamber of Commerce, Anheuser-Busch, Dow Chemical, The Royal Bank of Canada, John-Mansville, American Bankers Assn., Sales Marketing Executives (Atlanta, Dallas, Los Angeles), District 50 schools, Canon City schools, Ft. Collins schools. The presentation "What You Are Is Where You Were When" is an intensive sweep through the "Value Programming" experiences of age groups that provides valuable insights into understanding human behavior.